



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

13

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,261	07/22/2004	Giuseppe Alvaro	P14748USW	9544
23347	7590	11/02/2006	EXAMINER	
GLAXOSMITHKLINE			BERNHARDT, EMILY B	
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MAI B475				
FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398			1624	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/502,261	ALVARO ET AL.
	Examiner Emily Bernhardt	Art Unit 1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16 and 19-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/22/04&2/7/05&5/31/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: ____.

Claims 1-12,14,16 and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds as the free base or salt forms, does not reasonably provide enablement for scope of solvates. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and thus use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims which all embrace any solvate are nonenabled since generally not all solvents can form solvates with all compounds. There is no process enabling such a scope in the specification nor is there any guidance as to what type of solvents would be suitable for instant compounds.

Note Vippagunta, provided with this action, who flatly states on p.18, section 3.4 the following: “Predicting the formation of solvates or hydrates of a compound.... is complex and difficult. Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for a series of related compounds.”

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 19-21 are of indeterminate scope for the following reasons. Defining a disease(s) by its (their) underlying cause renders the scope of intended uses indeterminate since the claim language may read on diseases not yet known to be caused by or affected by such action or in ways not yet understood. Additionally, determining whether a given disease responds or not to “tachykinins” involves much experimentation since a negative response from one patient does not mean the drug isn't useful as no drug has 100% effectiveness. Thus what “success rate” determines if a particular antagonist is effective and how many patients (and dosage regimens) need to be tested? The test for determining compliance with 35 USC 112, par. two is whether applicants have clearly defined “their” invention not what may be discovered by future research as this type of claim language clearly requires.

Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for **treating** the diseases recited in claims 23 and 24, does not reasonably provide enablement for those claimed in 19-22. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

From a reading of the specification the list of diseases covered by claims 19-22 include all forms of dementias, gastrointestinal disorders, sleep disorders, substance abuse, etc. The notion that such a range of uses can be treated simply by a compound having NK-1 activity is not substantiated by the current state of the art such as Ohnmact, provided with this action. See Hoffman v. Klaus, 9 USPQ 2d 1657; Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 924 regarding the standard of testing needed to show *in vivo* efficacy.

Applicants' IDS statements have been considered. Duplicate entries have been crossed out. WO'867 while of similar backbone is limited to substituents on piperazine ring which have been excluded by applicants' proviso (ii). US'621 is also similar but lacks "R5" choices permitted herein when X and Y are both CH₂.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emily Bernhardt whose telephone number is 571-272-0664.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the acting supervisor for AU 1624, James O. Wilson can be reached at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.



Emily Bernhardt
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624